

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF GENDER EDUCATION ON SEXISM: EVIDENCE FROM COLLEGE STUDENTS IN MADRID

EVALUACIÓN DEL IMPACTO DE LA EDUCACIÓN DE GÉNERO EN EL SEXISMO: EVIDENCIA DE LOS ESTUDIANTES UNIVERSITARIOS EN MADRID

M^a Isabel Cepeda González

Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

Email: mariaisabel.cepeda@urjc.es

Recibido: enero de 2018

Aceptado: mayo de 2018

Palabras clave: Sexismo ambivalente; género; estudiantes universitarios; educación; prevención

Key words: Ambivalent sexism; gender; college students; education; prevention

Resumen: El objetivo de este estudio es evaluar el impacto de la educación de género en el nivel de sexismo ambivalente en los estudiantes universitarios de Madrid. Para lograr este objetivo, estudiamos una muestra de 280 estudiantes de la Universidad Rey Juan Carlos de Madrid (220 mujeres y 60 hombres). 126 son estudiantes con especialización en Criminología que recibieron 60 horas de educación de género. 154 son estudiantes con especialización en Enfermería que no recibieron educación de género. Elegimos estudiantes en Criminología y Enfermería porque su práctica profesional está vinculada a la violencia de género. La metodología consistió en aplicar la Escala de Detección del Sexismo en Adolescentes. Los resultados muestran que los estudiantes que aprendieron sobre el género son menos sexistas. De los estudiantes con educación de género, las mujeres son menos sexistas. Nuestro estudio es una investigación orientada a la acción, ya que proporciona información útil para los profesionales interesados en crear acciones para prevenir el sexismo entre los estudiantes universitarios.

Abstract: The goal of this study is to evaluate the impact of gender education on the level of ambivalent sexism in Madrid college students. To achieve this goal, we study a sample of 280 students from the Universidad Rey Juan Carlos in Madrid (220 women and 60 men). 126 are students majoring in Criminology who had received 60 hours of gender education. 154 are students majoring in Nursing who received no gender education. We chose students in Criminology and Nursing because their professional practice is linked to gender violence. The methodology consisted of applying the Scale for Detection of Sexism in Adolescents. The results show that students

who learned about gender are less sexist. Of the students with gender education, women are less sexist. Our study is action-oriented research in that it provides information useful for professionals interested in creating actions to prevent sexism among college students.

1. Introduction

In spite of advances on gender issues in Western countries, equality of men and women is far from reality. Traditional cultures, education and messages transmitted in communications media contribute to normalize and perpetuate sexism and help to desensitize society to gender violence (GV). As a result, much sexist behaviour is considered normal and becomes invisible to society. Even the victims themselves have difficulty recognizing and identifying their experience as violence (Flood & Pease, 2009), especially when it does not involve physical or sexual aggression.

Ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996:491) is considered as one of the main causes of continued inequality between the sexes, which results in the justification and perpetuation of status hierarchies (Shields, 2007:93). Ambivalent sexism is what differentiates hostile sexism (HS) — which views women as inferior to men — from benevolent sexism (BS) — which finds women weak and incompetent (Becker & Swim, 2011:228), causing men to feel condescending and protective of women and thereby reinforcing women's subordination. BS can, however, conceal more hostile sexism (Recio *et al.*, 2007:526), as it involves a deeply anti-egalitarian attitude toward gender (Glick

& Fiske, 2011:532). Both BS and HS are forms of sexism; both foster gender inequalities (Durá *et al.*, 2006:129), strengthen existing prejudices, serve to justify the subordinate status of women (Glick & Fiske, 1996:494), and make it harder to achieve a state of equality between the sexes. As a result, actions undertaken to fight sexism must face both dimensions, especially when we consider that sexism can be a precursor to situations of GV (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2011: 332).

Although the struggle against HS is well established in egalitarian countries, the struggle against BS presents various problems. The first is the difficulty of detecting BS (Recio *et al.*, 2007:523). Because it is subtle, BS more often goes unnoticed. Its seemingly kindly attitude is less likely to arouse social alarm or rejection than HS. Many people still believe that BS behaviours are “pleasant” and “romantic” (Glick & Fiske, 2011:531). Since BS is not perceived as a threat, it may be ignored, or at least treated with benevolence (Expósito *et al.*, 2014:162). Second, actions that have been undertaken against BS to date are characterized by their lack of forcefulness. Third, BS is characterized by denial of the discrimination it involves (Swim *et al.*, 1995:202), as with modern racism (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2011:332; Glick & Fiske, 1996: 494; McConahay, 1986:575). Furthermore, increase in the discursive effects of postfeminism makes fighting sexism more difficult (Calder-Dawe, 2015:91). All of these factors can hinder change and the suppression of these attitudes.

Goal

For education and preventive action against sexism and GV to be effective, it

is crucial that the professionals designing them have real, current information based on knowledge of the beliefs young people hold about gender equality. Minimal or fairly out-of-date information is an obstacle to the efficacy of these actions.

The goal of this study is to compare the level of ambivalent sexism in college students who have received gender education to the level of sexism in college students who have not received gender education, by applying the Scale for Detection of Sexism in Adolescents (DSA) (Recio *et al.*, 2007:523). Our study aims to provide current, precise information to those responsible for designing preventive educational actions that focus on fighting sexism among college-age youth to avoid GV among couples. The results of the analysis will enable us to confirm whether gender education actions change young people's sexist attitudes substantially, or whether they have no notable influence. This study advances over previous studies (Ferrer *et al.*, 2006:365; Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2002: 126) by performing comparative analysis of the impact of specific gender education on sexist attitudes of college students using the DSA inventory.

Method

Participants

The sample was composed of 280 students at the Universidad Rey Juan Carlos in Madrid (Spain). Of these, 126 were students in the final year of the undergraduate Criminology programme, and 154 were students in the first two years of the undergraduate Nursing programme. 21.43% of participants

were men and 78.57% women. As is to be expected, Nursing programmes are highly feminized (81.16% of the Nursing students were women), which confirms that even now sexism and cultural and social stereotypes promote and reinforce gendering of occupations, and some professions are performed exclusively by men (Sayman, 2007:20). The study of Criminology is also feminized, although to a lesser extent (75.39% female students). Criminology, a very new profession, is feminized even though it does not fulfil the requirements typical of feminized professions — being related to social aid and care giving. Criminology does adhere, however, to some characteristics of the professions traditionally performed by women, that is, to the practice of cooperative exchange.

At the time of the survey, the students in Criminology had received 60 hours of education in the course Domestic and Gender Violence, while the Nursing students had not received any specific gender education.

Procedure

The sample was chosen based on the variable "major you are pursuing." The data were collected in November and December 2016, during class time. The participants were assured that the data would remain anonymous and confidential. To perform this study, we followed the ethical principles of the 1975 Helsinki Declaration of the World Medical Association in its 2013 updated version. We explained the nature of the research and its goals, and the researchers were present throughout the data collection process.

Design

This is a descriptive, cross-sectional study of prevalence (Argimon & Jiménez, 2004:23). It involves a self-administered scale that is individual and anonymous. To protect personal integrity and privacy, we numbered the questionnaires. The results were analysed using the statistical programme SPSS, version 22.0. We used the non-parametric Mann-Whitney's U test and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test after confirming normality with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Instruments

We used sociodemographic variables—age, sex, place of origin—and applied the Scale for DSA. The DSA scale has some good psychometric properties, differentiates appropriately between the two fundamental dimensions of sexism — hostile and benevolent — (Recio *et al.*, 2007:523), and provides a general measure to evaluate changes in sexist attitudes. The final version of the DSA scale is composed of 26 items, 16 of which serve to evaluate HS and 10 to evaluate BS (see Appendix). The response scale for the items is Likert type with 6 choices (from 1= «completely disagree» to 6= «completely agree»).

The DSA scale has several advantages over other scales. The Inventory of Distorted Thinking about Women and Violence (IDT-WV) (Echeburúa & Fernández-Montalvo, 1998:79) was designed for one-dimensional evaluation of the cognitive biases that violent men expressed against their partner. The DSA scale, in contrast, has the advantage of being oriented to detecting ambivalent sexism in non-adults who have not necessarily reached the point of

real situations of violence. Further, the properties of the DSA scale have been much more extensively contrasted (Recio *et al.*, 2007:526) than have the psychometric properties of the IDT-WV (Echeburúa *et al.*, 2016:838). The Social Desirability Scale (SDS) developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1960) is not recommended due to the low discrimination rates of enough of their items (Ferrando & Chico, 2000:384). The DSA scale has four advantages over the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996:491): a) it was constructed in Spain, the country in which our study was performed; b) the items of the ASI scale are preferentially focused on studying sexism in adults (they talk about work, competency, feminism), while the DSA scale has broader possibilities for use with samples of adolescents; c) the items that compose the DSA scale were obtained from the literature and from direct experience of professionals in matters of GV prevention; and d) the DSA scale has the advantage of showing more clearly than the ASI scale whether there is a higher degree of BS in women (Recio *et al.*, 2007:523).

Results

A. Sociodemographic data

The ages of the 126 Criminology students ranged from 20-58 years old (where \bar{x} =22.3 years is the average age and s = 4.147 years the standard deviation), while the 154 Nursing students were 17-49 years old (\bar{x} =20.4 years and s = 4.848 years). In the total sample of 280 students, the minimum age was 17 and the maximum 58 (\bar{x} =21.3 years, s = 4.367 years).

As to place of origin, most of the Criminology students were from a greater urban area (51.9%) and 35.3% from a smaller urban area. The percentage of Nursing students from a greater urban area was only 46.9%, very similar to the percentage from a smaller urban area (42.6%). In both cases, students from non-urban areas or from outside Spain represented a very small percentage. As the chi-square contrast to analyse whether or not the two variables are associated produced a value of $0.506 > 0.05$, we can conclude for, a confidence level of 95%, that place of origin is independent of the students' major.

Table 1. Results of chi-square contrast.
Association of variables *origin* and *sex*

	Value	p-value
Pearson's C contingency coefficient	0.066	0.727
No. of valid cases	295	

Source: Compiled by author using survey data

The $p\text{-value} = 0.727 > 0.05$ shows that there is no significant association between these two variables.

The variable *sex* is also independent of the variable *major*, ($p\text{-value} = 0.156 > 0.05$); there is no positive association between the two variables, as can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of chi-square contrast.
Association of variables *major* and *sex*

	Value	p-value
Pearson's C contingency coefficient	0.082	0.156
No. of valid cases	298	

Source: Compiled by author using survey data

B. Ambivalent sexism

All items were analysed based on major and sex, using Pearson's contingency coefficient to measure first the association between the qualitative variable "degree programme" and the categorical variable "responses to the different items." If the results are conclusive (gender education influences ambivalent sexism), we will analyze the association between the qualitative variable "sex" and the categorical variable "responses to the different items" in the group of students that is less tolerant of sexism.

Table 3. HS/BS; Pearson's contingency coefficient; p-value for each item

ÍTEMS	HS/BS	Coef. C	P-value*
1	BS	0,214	0,029
2	HS	0,122	0,342
3	BS	0,208	0,019
4	HS	0,118	0,527
5	HS	0,068	0,504
6	BS	0,172	0,104
7	HS	0,105	0,648
8	BS	0,128	0,426
9	HS	0,065	0,733
10	HS	0,116	0,539
11	BS	0,084	0,829
12	HS	0,163	0,149
13	BS	0,12	0,496
14	HS	0,086	0,697
15	BS	0,096	0,736
16	HS	0,112	0,282
17	BS	0,149	0,243
18	HS	0,187	0,028
19	HS	0,106	0,335
20	HS	0,142	0,192
21	BS	0,149	0,242
22	HS	0,065	0,531
23	HS	0,07	0,481
24	BS	0,26	0,001
25	HS	0,08	0,586
26	HS	0,124	0,325

*Bold indicates items that show an association
Source: Compiled by author using survey data

The results show significant differences between the Criminology and the Nursing students for items 1, 3, 18 and 24 with $p < 0.05$. We will now analyse the other items of interest that do not show an association.

Of the items related to BS, we see an association in Item 1, "Women are naturally more patient and tolerant," with a p-value of $= 0.029 < 0.05$. This item refers to the supposedly innate capacity of women to be more patient and tolerant than men. Whereas 36.6% of Criminology students *disagree completely*, only 26.1% of Nursing students chose this response. The responses *mostly disagree* and *somewhat disagree* are rejected by Criminology and accepted by Nursing. The reverse occurs with the response *somewhat agree*. Item 3, "Feeling and affection are more important for women than for men," also shows an association, with a p-value $= 0.019 < 0.05$. Here, the difference is even greater than for Item 1; 58.8% of Criminology students *completely disagree*, as opposed to 39.9% of Nursing students. Further, only 0.7% of Criminology students express that they *completely agree*, as opposed to 1.8% of Nursing students. In Item 24, "Women are naturally better suited than men to enduring suffering," major is again associated with response, with a p-value $= 0.001 < 0.05$. Criminology students who *completely disagree* constitute 72.8%, as opposed to 48.5% of Nursing students. Further, only 3.7% of Criminology students *somewhat agree* with this statement vs. 11.7% of Nursing students. Other items in the inventory related to BS are worth analysing even though they do not show an association, as in the case of Item 6, "Women are more suited than men to pleasing others."

Criminology students broadly reject Item 12, “Women are naturally manipulative”: disagree completely (82.4%) or mostly disagree (14.7%) for a total rejection of 97.1%, as opposed to 91.9% rejection by Nursing students: disagree completely (82.6%) or mostly disagree (9.35%). The same occurs with Item 8, “Because they are more sensitive, women are more understanding than men toward their partners.” 54.9% of Criminology students *disagree completely* with this statement, five points above the 49.1% of Nursing students who express total rejection. The results of Item 11, “No one knows how to raise children like their mothers,” are interesting. 80.2% of Nursing students show some rejection (*completely disagree*, 61.1%; *mostly disagree*, 19.1%), while disagreement increases to 84.5% among Criminology students (*completely*, 66.9%; *mostly*, 17.6%). Finally, in Item 17, “Women are naturally more sensitive than men,” 53.7% of future criminologists *disagree completely*, nine points above the percentage of Nursing students who chose this response (44.2%).

As to items related to HS, we see a correlation in Item 18, “Housework is not a man’s job,” with a $p\text{-value} = 0.028 < 0.05$. Criminology students express rejection, responding *disagree completely* (response count: 116 < expected frequency: 120.1), in contrast to the attraction among Nursing students (response count: 148 > expected frequency: 143.9). Whereas 85.3% of the Criminology students *disagree completely*, considerably more Nursing students chose this result; 90.8% express that they *disagree completely*. Other items related to HS do not show an association but provide interesting results. Criminology students widely

reject Item 2, “The best place for a woman is at home with her family”, with 94.1% *disagreeing completely*, whereas the milder response of Nursing students shows that only 88.9% *disagree completely*. The same occurs with Item 4, “Women are weaker than men in all respects”: 88.9% of Criminology students *disagree completely*, somewhat more than two points above the percentage of Nursing students, whereas 0% of Criminology students *mostly disagree*, as opposed to 0.6% of Nursing students. Criminology students broadly reject Item 12, “Women are naturally manipulative”: *disagree completely* (82.4%) or *mostly disagree* (14.7%) for a total rejection of 97.1%, as opposed to 91.9% rejection by Nursing students: *disagree completely* (82.6%) or *mostly disagree* (9.35%).

We will now analyze whether the sex of the Criminology students, who received information on gender issues and show greater rejection than Nursing students of any kind of sexism — is an important factor determining responses to the categorical variables.

Table 4. HS/BS: association between “sex” and “responses to each item” (Criminology students). Pearson’s contingency coefficient; p-value

ÍTEMs	HS/BS	Coef. C	P-value*
1	BS	0,305	0,018
2	HS	0,152	0,201
3	BS	0,143	0,727
4	HS	0,170	0,405
5	HS	0,207	0,049
6	BS	0,187	0,299
7	HS	0,136	0,770
8	BS	0,123	0,843
9	HS	0,204	0,055
10	HS	0,219	0,148
11	BS	0,193	0,392
12	HS	0,151	0,368
13	BS	0,208	0,294
14	HS	0,164	0,294
15	BS	0,208	0,293
16	HS	0,207	0,014
17	BS	0,114	0,883
18	HS	0,158	0,327
19	HS	0,208	0,049
20	HS	0,189	0,171
21	BS	0,156	0,337
22	HS	0,070	0,718
23	HS	0,209	0,040
24	BS	0,138	0,761
25	HS	0,073	0,695
26	HS	0,163	0,297

*Bold indicates the items that show an association.
Source: Compiled by author using survey data

The p-values of the Pearson’s contingency coefficients for Items 1, 5, 16, 19 and 23 indicate dependence among the variables of sex and their corresponding responses. Although the other items do not show significant differences, it is interesting to analyse some responses.

On the items related to BS, both young men and young women express a high percentage of complete disagreement (38.20% and 36.40%, respectively). Whereas young men *mostly agree* (23.50%) or *somewhat agree* (14.70%), implying that 38.20% have some level of agreement with the statement, the percentage of young women who *completely agree* (2%), *mostly agree* (4%) or *slightly agree* (26.30%) shows that only 32.30% affirm some level of agreement. These six points of difference are significant and show that some gender stereotypes persist and that young women thus tend to see themselves as having naturally different ways of being than men.

We find a subtle difference in the responses to Item 3, “Feeling and affection are more important for women than for men.” Although *complete disagreement* predominates in both sexes, men reject it more strongly (64.70%) than do women (57.40%). Whereas 8.80% of young men *mostly disagree*, the figure rises to 18.80% in questionnaires completed by women. We observe a subtle tendency among young women to see themselves as beings for whom feeling has more weight, as endowed with innate characteristics for empathy and as perceiving men as people less dependent on the affect perception. All of this points to greater acceptance of BS among women. In Item 8, “Because they are more sensitive, women are more understanding than men toward their partner,” the percentage of young men who

completely disagree (45.50%) or *mostly disagree* (24.20%) is lower than that of young women who *completely disagree* (57.60) or *mostly disagree* (17.20%). For Item 13, "Women have a greater capacity than men to forgive defects in their partner," the percentage of young men who *completely disagree* is 52.90%, a figure that increases to 62.40% for young women. Ten points of difference are qualitatively very interesting. For Item 15, on the appeal that fragile women have for men, 82.40% of men *completely disagree*, a chosen by is only 68.30% of the women. Men continue to have a greater tendency to appreciate the appeal of fragility in women.

The items related to HS show no basic discrepancies, as both young men and young women express to a great extent that they *strongly disagree*. The weight of this response varies significantly from person to person, making it an interesting result to analyze.

On Item 5, which proposes women staying at home as a solution to end unemployment, both young men and young women emphatically *absolutely disagree*. Whereas women show 100% *total disagreement*, however, 2.90% of young men *mostly disagree*, and 2.90% *somewhat disagree*. These differences in response reveal traces of the entrenched idea of the model of the *male breadwinner*. Likewise, Item 9, "Keeping house well is the woman's duty," is emphatically rejected by the great majority of young men and young women (91.20% and 99%, respectively). The seven points of difference between the men's and women's responses again show the ingrained presence of sexist stereotypes in society and the resistance of some domestic tasks to masculinization. Item 14 refers to a competitive gender differentiation. "Men should be the main

breadwinner for their family." 88.20% of young men *disagree completely* vs. 94% of young women. This is very similar to the response to Item 16, "The husband is the head of the family, and the wife must respect his authority." 94.10% of young men *completely disagree*, as opposed to 100% of young women. For Item 19, "Women reason worse than men," it is worrisome that the great majority of men (90.10%) and women (99%) *completely disagree*, 6.10% of the students *mostly disagree*, and 3% express only *some disagreement*. These responses are important because dominating paternalism is one of the most frequent components of HS. For Item 21, that women are irreplaceable in the home, we find that 73.50% of young men *completely disagree*, a percentage considerably lower than that for young women (84.20%). We see from this response that social change concerning women in Spain has accelerated in recent decades, despite the persistence of patriarchal vision forged by old forms of masculine domination. The results of Item 23, "Men should make the most important decisions in the couple's life" is very noteworthy. 91.20% of young men *completely disagree*, as opposed to 98% of young women, but 2.90% of young men *mostly disagree*, and a full 5.90% only *somewhat disagree*.

2. Discussion and conclusions

The results of our study show that the Nursing students who participated in our study express greater acceptance (or less rejection) of sexism in any of its manifestations, BS or HS. There is only one item of association between "major" and "responses to the items" in which the Nursing students showed greater

rejection than Criminology students: Item 18. This is an odd result without a logical explanation in light of the other results, surely motivated by the massive feminization of the Nursing programme. It is important to remember that the Nursing students had not received specific gender education by the time they completed the survey, whereas the Criminology students had received 60 hours of education in the material. The Criminology students were not only more adverse than the Nursing students to sexism but also show a more intense rejection of the HS-related items than of the items related to BS.

From the previous results, it follows that BS is present among our youth, a significant percentage of whom continue to consider women in a stereotyped way, with more emotivity than rationality and as limited to certain roles. This view contributes to justification and perpetuation of status hierarchies. The acceptance of BS is, however, much lower among the students who received gender education. Such education contributed to making the risk of BS visible to these young people. They thus reject sexism more categorically, while it passes more unnoticed among the young people who have not received gender education.

If we analyse ambivalent sexism as a function of sex among the students who did receive gender education, we find that women reject both BS and HS more than men, but we also confirm that a significant percentage of women accept BS, which they have internalized and normalized. The broad rejection of HS by the women Criminology students shows that social change with respect to women in Spain has accelerated in recent decades, despite the persistence of a patriarchal vision forged by old forms of masculine domination.

The study results are relevant for several reasons. First, they show that students who received specific gender education express greater rejection of all forms of sexism. Our study shows that the students who received education in GV pay greater attention to sexism, are better able to detect it, and show greater consciousness of masculine privileges, corroborating Potter's statement that gender relations cannot be intuitive but must be learned (Potter, 2008).

The results obtained enable us to affirm that gender education in the college environment contributes to making sexism and GV visible among young people, positively influencing their value structure and helping to triggering greater rejection of sexism and GV.

Second, as a result of the previous point, it is important for the education system—and, by extrapolation, for other agents with the capacity for social influence, such as communications media—to promote egalitarian education in gender values that contributes to eliminating sexist stereotypes in order ultimately to eradicate GV. We show that educational programmes, especially intensive and extensive ones, produce lasting changes in sexist attitudes and behaviours (Flood, 2005-2006). It is thus important to incorporate specific material on gender, sexism and GV into college students' curriculum in general, especially for those whose future professional practice will involve cases of GV.

Third, the results highlight the danger that, even now, BS poses as an underlying system justifying and legitimating sexist attitudes. The results suggest that actions directed to college youth should stress the sexist nature of BS. Understanding BS and making it visible prepare young people to discover sexism in its different

dimensions, to detect stereotyped and discriminatory behaviour, and to dismantle inequalities (Klein, 2016). Educational actions addressed to college students on issues of sexism must thus insist on the danger of BS.

Fourth, even among the students who received gender education, women show greater rejection than men of any form of sexism, but especially of HS.

These results can serve as the basis for creation and implementation of efficient actions designed to decrease sexism and GV among today's college youth, as they show the importance young people attribute to BS and HS, as well as the influence of gender education on sexist attitudes. These results provide professionals with current information for creation of strategies, specific programmes and preventive actions against sexism among college youth.

As to the study's limitations, first, as the sample was incidental, we must be cautious in generalizing from the results obtained. Future surveys to enrich the conclusions reached. Second, the majors chosen are highly feminized. It would be interesting to perform the survey on majors with a less predominant presence of women to avoid possible distortion of results by sex. Further, it would be interesting for future research to provide the responses of the students themselves before and after receiving specific gender education. Finally, gender education triggers rejection of sexist attitudes among Spanish college youth, unveils sexist situations previously concealed by the subtlety of benevolent sexism and gives interested professionals information with which to design programmes and preventive actions against sexism among college youth effectively in order to eradicate GV in couples.

Bibliography

- Argimon, J. M., & Jiménez, J. (2004). Métodos de investigación clínica y epidemiológica. *Métodos de investigación clínica y epidemiológica*.
- Arriaga Flórez, M., Martín Clavijo, M. & Marín Conejo, S. (2015). Language y género: aproximaciones desde un marco teórico. Universidad de Sevilla.
- Becker J. C., Swim J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as a way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35, 227–242.
- Calder-Dawe, O. (2015). The choreography of everyday sexism: Reworking sexism in interaction. *New Formations*, 86(86), 89-105.
- Cuadrado, I., Recio, P., y Ramos, E. (2007): "Propiedades psicométricas de la escala de detección de sexismo en adolescentes, DSA", *Psicothema*, Vol. 19, N. 3: 522-528.
- Durá, A; Garaigordobil, M (2006). "Neosexismo en adolescentes de 14 a 17 años: relaciones con autoconcepto-autoestima, personalidad, psicopatología, problemas de conducta y habilidades sociales", *Clínica y Salud*, Vol. 17, N. 2, 127-149.
- Echeburúa, E., y Fernández-Montalvo, J. (1998): "Hombres maltratadores", in E. Echeburúa, y P. Corral (Eds.), *Manual de violencia familiar* (pp: 73-90), Siglo XXI. Madrid, España.
- Echeburúa, E., Amor, P.J., Sarasua, B., et al. F.P. (2016): "Inventario de Pensamientos Distorsionados sobre la Mujer y el Uso de la Violencia - Revisado (IPDMUV-R): propiedades psicométricas", *Anales de psicología*, Vol. 32, nº 3: 837-846.
- Expósito, F; Moya, M.C; and Glick, P. (1998): "Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos", *Revista de Psicología Social*, 13: 159-169.

- Expósito, F; Moya, M.C; and Glick, P. (2014): "Ambivalent sexism: Measurement and correlates", *International Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 13, 1998 - Issue 2: 159-169.
- Ferrando, P.J. and Chico, E. (2000): "Adaptación y análisis psicométrico de la escala de deseabilidad social de Marlowe y Crowne", *Psicothema*, Vol. 12, N. 3: 383-389.
- Ferrer VA, Bosch E, Ramis MC, Torres G, Navarro C (2006) La violencia contra las mujeres en la pareja: creencias y actitudes en estudiantes universitarios. *Psicothema*; 18(3): 359-66.
- Garaigordobil, M., & Aliri, J. (2011). Sexismo hostil y benevolente: relaciones con el autoconcepto, el racismo y la sensibilidad intercultural. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 16 (2), 331-350.
- Glick, P. y Fiske, S. T. (2011): "Ambivalent Sexism Revisited", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol 35, Issue 3: 530-535.
- Glick, P. y Fiske, S. T. (1996): "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70: 491-512.
- Lameiras, M., & Rodríguez, Y. (2002). Evaluación del sexismo moderno en adolescentes. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 17(2), 119-127.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986): "Modern racism". In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125), New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Potter, A. (2008): *Gender Sensitivity: nicety or necessity in peace-process management?* The Oslo Forum Network of Mediators.
- Recio, P; Ramos, E; Cuadrado, I; (2007). Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala de Detección de Sexismo en Adolescentes (DSA). *Psicothema*, 522-528.
- Sayman, D.M. (2007): "The Elimination of Sexism and Stereotyping in Occupational Education", *The Journal of Men's Studies*, Vol 15, Issue 1, 2007.
- Shields, S. A. (2007). Passionate men, emotional women: Psychology constructs gender difference in the late 19th century. *History of Psychology*, 10(2), 92-110.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., and Hunter, B. A. (1995): "Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68: 199-214.
- World Medical Association-WMA (2013). *Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects*, version of 2013, (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24141714>). DOI: 10.1001/jama.2013.281053. Consultation 03/04/2017.

Appendix

1. Male	Age:	Place of Origin:	1. Greater urban area
Sex			2. Smaller urban area
2. Female			3. Non-urban area
			4. Foreign country

DSA – Scale for Detection of Sexism in Adolescents (E. Ramos, I. Cuadrado and P. Recio)

Use an X to indicate your degree of Agreement or Disagreement with each of the following statements, based on the following scale:

1. Completely disagree; 2. Mostly disagree; 3. Somewhat disagree; 4. Somewhat agree; 5. Mostly agree; 6. Completely agree

Variables	Labels	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sex	Sex						
Age	Age						
Place of origin	Place of origin						
DSA1	Women are naturally more patient and tolerant than men.						
DSA2	The best place for a woman is at home with her family.						
DSA3	Feeling and affection are more important for women than for men.						
DSA4	Women are weaker than men in all respects.						
DSA5	A positive way of ending unemployment would be for women to stay at home.						
DSA6	Women are more suited than men to pleasing others (at being attentive to what others want and need).						
DSA7	It is more natural for daughters than for sons to care for elderly parents.						
DSA8	Because they are more sensitive, women are more understanding than men toward their partners.						
DSA9	Keeping the house well is a woman's duty.						
DSA10	You have to put women in their place so they don't dominate men.						
DSA11	No one knows how to raise their children like women do.						
DSA12	Women are naturally manipulative.						
DSA13	Women have a greater capacity than men to forgive defects in their partners.						
DSA14	Men should be the main breadwinners in their family.						
DSA15	Fragile women are especially appealing to men.						
DSA16	The husband is the head of the family, and the wife must respect his authority.						
DSA17	Women are naturally more sensitive than men.						
DSA18	Housework is not a man's job.						
DSA19	Women reason worse than men.						
DSA20	Men are more qualified than women for public matters (for example, politics, business, etc.).						
DSA21	Women are irreplaceable in the home.						
DSA22	A woman who works outside the home is neglecting her family.						
DSA23	Men should make the most important decisions in the couple's life.						
DSA24	Women are naturally better suited than men to endure suffering.						
DSA25	A woman must be willing to sacrifice herself for her husband's professional success.						
DSA26	A man must guide his wife with affection but firmness.						

